5-2-2012

Information Technology Committee Meeting Minutes, May 2, 2012

Information Technology Committee

Draft Minutes: University Faculty Senate IT Committee Meeting
May 2, 2012

Attending: Ann Bowling (College of Nursing and Health), Rudy Fichtenbaum (Raj Soin College of Business), Larry Fox (Computing and Telecommunications Services), Mike Natale (Computing and Telecommunications Services), John Gallagher (College of Engineering and Computer Science), Terri Klaus (Center for Teaching and Learning), Rebecca Teed (College of Science and Mathematics)

The meeting started at approximately 9:00 AM on Wednesday, May 2 2012.

Fee for Installation of Whole-Disk Encryption Software on Laptops
Larry Fox (CaTS) reported that the $25 fee for installation of university provided whole-disk encryption software was problematic and requested that this committee make a recommendation for the university to cover those fees directly as opposed to charging them back to individual units. The committee agreed and makes this recommendation by unanimous vote. Therefore:

The Faculty Senate IT committee recommends that the university absorb the cost of installing whole-disk encryption software on current and future laptops allocated to faculty and staff.

CaTS brought several project items to the attention of the committee. Project descriptions are attached at the end of these minutes. The committee disposed of each item as follows:

Project #33: Proactive Vulnerability Scans
This project represents a slight, and prudent, modification to current practice related to scanning on-campus servers that provide services (Web, etc.) to off-campus users. **The Faculty Senate IT committee recommends that this project go forward and passes it to the Senate Executive Committee for its consideration.**

Project #34: Portal Replacement/Upgrade
This project represents a major change to how the university conducts business and presages the replacement and/or heavy upgrade of the current university portal (Wings, etc.). **The Faculty Senate IT committee recommends that requirements, specifications, and product research be completed and fully documented in a written report to the university committee. The committee looks forward to reviewing this document in the Fall of 2012.**

Project #35: Locking Electronic Classrooms at Night

This project is informational to this committee and has also been brought to building and grounds. **The Faculty Senate IT committee has no recommendations for modification for this project and no comments on it. We see no reason this should not be reviewed by the Executive Committee.**

Faculty Email and the Microsoft Live Project

The committee also considered CaTS provided answers to a number of questions about both the operation of Microsoft Live email project and the processes used to determine that this product was most appropriate, subject to reasonable constraints, for the university. Those questions and answers are attached at the end of these minutes.

Although the committee feels there are serious deficiencies in the process by which the decision to adopt this project was made, we appreciate CaTS efforts in answering the questions. We remain concerned, however, that no significant documentation exists of the process of engaging the university community to develop requirements, draft specifications, and identify solutions. This places CaTS in a poor position to justify their decisions and deprives the university community of the information necessary to make any intelligent commentary.

The committee chair (John Gallagher) has agreed to work with CaTS over the summer to assist in development of guidelines for requirements identification, specification development, and documentation of justifications for decisions made. The results of this effort will be reported to the University Faculty IT committee in the Fall of 2012 with the intent to use those guidelines in the conduct of project #34 – Portal Replacement/Upgrade.

Despite our disappointment in the lack of appropriate documentation of an acceptable engineering process, the **Faculty Senate IT committee recommends that CaTS move forward with their plan to move faculty onto the Microsoft Live email product during the summer of 2012.**

Informational Items

CaTS will move forward with opening the Tegrity system to all faculty in the Fall of 2012. Tegrity has been well-received by the faculty testers.

Disk drives to support backup of faculty computers should be available soon pending some final administrative actions. A process by which faculty can request and be provided with local backup solutions for their university computers will be announced.

CaTS Projects
Security

Date: April 5, 2012
Initiative: Proactive Vulnerability Scans
CaTS impact to Faculty: Low/Medium
CaTS impact to Students: N/A
Proposed Timeline: June 2012
Scope: Implement a vulnerability scan procedure for all newly registered servers prior to opening internet access through the university firewall. In addition, implement a bi-annual vulnerability scan of all registered servers and provide vulnerability reports to the owners of the servers.
Reason: Wright State was recently contacted by the FBI, informing us that the Wright.edu domain was on a target list a hacker who is a known member of the group Anonymous. They are a well-known group with a record of compromising computer systems. Including a vulnerability scan of systems prior to exposing those systems to the outside world should reduce the chances of system compromise. A bi-annual scan will help identify new vulnerabilities in a more timely fashion.
Specific Impact to Faculty: This will be a focused impact in that only those individuals who manage servers on campus that open services to the world will be impacted. This may require additional effort on the part of the above faculty members in addressing issues that are found in the vulnerability scans.

Specific impact to Students: There should be no impact to the students since we do not allow students to register servers.

CaTS Projects
Information Services

Date: April 13, 2012
Initiative: Portal Replacement/Upgrade
CaTS Impact to Faculty: Medium/High
CaTS Impact to Students: Medium/High
Proposed Timeline: By Fall 2013
Scope: Replace or upgrade the university portal, WINGS. This may be an upgrade using the same Luminis platform or a completely new portal platform (Drupal is currently being considered). An assessment of current portal content and functionality will be completed based on usage statistics, feedback from the community, and guidance from an advisory committee. It is presumed that the portal would still provide:

- Single sign-on into campus services where appropriate/feasible
- Content and service access would continue to be based on client role (i.e., students see different content from faculty and staff)
- Some content personalization may exist (e.g., campus announcement communications based on role and/or preferences, web page content based on attributes of the individual such as a student's major, or resident in campus housing, etc.)
- The portal would continue to serve as a campus communications center, attempting to locate most broadcast messaging there.

If we replace the Luminis platform as opposed to upgrade to the next release then Course Studio would be eliminated. Faculty would then need to use Desire2Learn or another option, or if necessary CaTS would attempt to find an alternative to Course Studio.
Reason: A new release of Luminis is available and CaTS will eventually either need to upgrade to the new release or find an alternative. This upgrade of Luminis will be significant since the underlying technology base is changing. The effort we put into this Luminis upgrade could be fairly similar to implementing a different, simpler portal platform. We will also be renewing our license agreement with Ellucian (previously known as SunGard) in September 2013 and eliminating Luminis could save the university as much as $25,000/year, especially if replaced with an open source alternative like Drupal. Now is a good time for us to assess our options.
Specific Impact to Faculty: Faculty using Course Studio would either need to begin using Desire2Learn or an alternative tool.
Specific Impact to Students: Some students have complained of the confusion of having multiple course tools they need to use. Eliminating Course Studio could be seen as a benefit to those students.

CaTS Projects
Client Services

Date: April 16, 2012
Initiative: Locking Electronic Classrooms at Night
CaTS impact to Faculty: Low
CaTS impact to Students: Low
Proposed Timeline: Fall Semester 2012
Scope: Classroom Technology Support (CTS) will begin locking all electronic classrooms by 11:59pm Monday through Thursday and by 9:00pm on Friday. CTS will leave 3 electronic classrooms open, 002MH, 009MH, and 028MH, for student academic use on a 24-hour basis. In addition, CaTS 24-hour computer labs, 042DL, 058DL, 008LX, 012LX, 016LX, 026LX, 039MH, 043MH, 064RK, and 072RK, will be available throughout campus for student use. Students will also be able to reserve electronic classrooms in advance through the Student Union Administrative Office. Doors will remain unlocked for classes scheduled on the weekends.
Reason: To reduce damage and theft in the electronic classrooms and enhance the accountability of the students and student groups that use these rooms at night.
Specific impact to Faculty: The faculty will see a decrease in delays of morning classes due to unforeseen issues with the electronic equipment or unsuitable classroom conditions as CTS will perform routine checks and maintenance at night before locking the classrooms. CTS will then be able to open each room in time for morning classes without unexpected maintenance or repairs to perform.
Specific impact to Students: The students will continue to have access to computer labs and electronic classrooms on a 24-hour basis.
Status: Reviewed by Student Government Spring qQarter 2012. Decision - no benefit or detriment to students. Reviewed by Building & Grounds Committee Spring Quarter 2012. Decision – no objections. Pending IT Committee review.

To: Faculty Senate IT Committee Members
From: John Gallagher, Faculty Senate IT Committee Chair
Date: 2/16/12
Re: Collected student, staff, and faculty concerns about Raider Mail migration

Note: CaTS provided answers are interleaved with the text of this memo. Those answers are shown in BROWN TEXT.

Wright State has recently started migration of student email accounts to an outside service vendor (Microsoft). Such outsourcing is becoming commonplace at universities and it is likely the case that our outsourcing of email and related services is both technologically and economically superior to our current in-house solutions. However, there remain a number of concerns each of which is likely in need of some level of treatment. The first set of concerns are with respect to what processes were used to assess campus email needs and how those assessments were used to choose the specific vendor (Microsoft). The second set of concerns are with respect to what seem to be ongoing service issues that may or may not have been resultant from that choice. This memo will outline those concerns that have been communicated to me during about two weeks of discussions with various students, staff, and faculty. It will also offer a number of questions that, in my opinion, should be addressed before moving on to full outsourcing of faculty and staff email and calendars.

The first set of concerns is with respect to the process by which the email/calendar vendor was chosen. It should not be a surprise that both Google and Microsoft are competing for university email and computer services business and both have competitive offerings in this market. It also should not be a surprise that neither choice will make everyone equally happy and that at least in some measure, opinions will vary from unit to unit across campus. In this context, it is perhaps even more important than usual to have adopted some systematic means of assessing users' needs and balancing those needs against financial and legal concerns. Consider, for example, the following *Business Insider* article and services comparison grid prepared by UC Berkley:

http://articles.businessinsider.com/2011-12-23/tech/30547371_1_google-apps-google-products-migration

http://technology.berkeley.edu/productivity-suite/google/matrix.html

Even a cursory comparison of the two major vendors seems to indicate that the choice of mail and calendar hosting service that balances service, compliance, and financial and security concerns is not simple. Some faculty members have expressed concern that a sufficient study of alternatives has not been conducted. To help alleviate these concerns, it would be useful to provide the Faculty Senate IT committee and the UUAP Academic Services Committee information on what service requirements were established, who was consulted to help create those requirements, and how the specific choice of Microsoft directly addresses those requirements. A simple table of requirements and comments on the relative merits of the vendors in the context of work and study at WSU in the style of the Berkely grid would be particularly useful in this regard.

The second set of concerns are focused on questions about Raider Mail service as it exists now and inherently presume that Microsoft is and was the correct choice. In no particular order, these are:

1) When accessing Raider Mail as an exchange server via the standard Android client, Raider Mail asks for complete administrator privilege on the device. This means that WSU and/or Microsoft can read and/or delete anything on the phone, including the contents of private non-WSU mailboxes, call data, and SMS messages. It also means that these entities can do a remote full reset and clear all data on privately owned phones as a necessary condition of accepting Raider Mail services in full.

   In order to enable the active sync service for email and calendar with Iphone and Android clients, an Exchange server requires that you enable security to continue synchronizing. This is true for Live@edu and the Exchange configuration for Google email, to provide security and remote device management. Enabling security also allows you or an administrator to remotely wipe the remote device. Google email can sync using Google sync or imap as well.

   There is also the option of using the web browser on your phone to access your email. This method does not require any special privileges be given.

2) Students have been reporting huge amounts of spam email being sent to Raider Mail accounts. This issue had been briefly touched on at a recent IT committee meeting. However, the issue remains ongoing. Further, many students reported to me that they are forwarding their mail to Google in part to strip out spam and junk email.

   HEAT tickets haven't indicated that clients are reporting huge amounts of spam. There have been increased phishing attempts and with changes to the phishing rules, Proofpoint has been tagging additional messages on the subject line [POSSIBLE PHISHING SCAM] and moving the message to the quarantine. Messages from the Internet are still analyzed with the on campus Proofpoint servers. Microsoft servers would analyze messages sent within Live@edu. Staff that have moved to Live@edu have not noticed an increase in spam. The CaTS staff will work with clients experiencing an increase in spam.

3) Raider Mail supports two web clients. When logging into email from a Windows machine, users see one client. When logging into email from other machines (specifically linux devices), one is provided a "lite" client that is far less featured and, incredibly, provides no good way of forwarding email from raider mail to other aggregators. Multiple, differently functioning, WSU supported interfaces to the same content is a possible liability, especially in an environment in which there is a diversity of computing tools used in the field.

   There are full-featured, supported browsers for Office365 for Small Business, Office365 Enterprise and Live@edu for Windows, Macintosh and Linux. The only configuration that does not support all features is Google Chrome in the Linux

environment. The light version is intended for accessibility purposes and will run with any Web browser but does have some feature limitations.

Below is a comparison of clients and the features supported. Microsoft's intent is to provide a full-featured experience is as many browsers as possible.

E-mail program	Edit and view contacts, calendar items, tasks, and e-mail messages	Edit and view e-mail folders in addition to the Inbox	Listen to your voice mail	Access your information offline	Automatic set-up	Accessibility for users who are blind or have low vision
Outlook Web App	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Not applicable	No
The light version of Outlook Web App	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Not applicable	Yes
Outlook 2007 or Outlook 2010	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Outlook 2011 for Mac	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Entourage 2008, Web Services Edition	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Programs that use Exchange ActiveSync	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Some programs may support accessibility features.
Programs that use Exchange ActiveSync	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not available
Programs that use POP3	No	No	No	Yes	No	Some programs may support accessibility features.
Programs that use IMAP4	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Some programs may support accessibility features.

4) There are ongoing reports of lost emails both coming into and leaving Raider Mail. These are not bounced mails that leave a trace of their having existed. These emails completely disappear with no trace. We are detecting this problem via student reports of emails about course material having been never received with no attendant notice to the sending faculty member that the mail had not been received.

   When CaTS has received reports of lost messages our investigation has found that it was typically client error. Review of Wright State email logs and message headers, which give great detail on the route an email took, recipients, anti-virus and anti-spam rules, etc., have determined that the message was either not actually sent by the student to a faculty member or that the faculty member had not sent a message to the student. We will continue to investigate any reported problems. We are also continually working to improve our documentation.

5) Some users are reporting difficulties in pulling email from Raider Mail via pop and/or IMAP. It is clear that there is an intent to support these capabilities, as port and connection information is published by CaTS. However, apparent problems remain with authentication. See also item #6 below.

   Please see the response to Question #7.

6) There are occasional reports of strange authentication system interactions between Wings and Raider Mail. For example, there are reports that from time to time, users who log into Raider Mail become temporarily unable to log into Wings with the same still valid password. Are there resource locking problems due to federated identity management or similar mechanisms for access to WSU authentication databases?

   Please see the response to Question #9.

7) Mail forwarded from Raider Mail seems to be put into a trash box and not deleted. There appears to be no "forward and delete" option like that supported in the current email system. This necessitates people using aggregators to manually empty Raider Mail trash on a regular basis.

   Please see the response to Question #8 which explains how to enable this option.

Based on the listed concerns, I have formulated the following list of questions whose answers, I hope, would calm any lingering fears among faculty and staff. I would request that answers to these questions be provided to both the Faculty Senate IT committee and the AAUP Academic Services Committee.

1) Did Wright State University conduct any systematic and comprehensive evaluation of the benefits and drawbacks of Google vs. Microsoft as a vendor for email and calendar services? Was anything like the Berkely study completed? If so, can the relevant reports and data be provided? If not, what was the rational basis for having made the decision? Can we see supporting evidence and requirements against which the decision that was made. Can we see the list of campus wide priorities that this decision serves? Who was consulted in making this list of priorities? Please note that these questions are distinct from questions about the appropriateness of the chosen vendor. These are questions about the process used to choose the vendor.

In retrospect, the process used to select the new email system should have been more formal and engaged more members of the university community. While many of the steps taken followed a typical product selection process documentation of the process and decision making process was not as robust as it should have been. Following is a summary of some of the steps that were taken that lead us to our recommendation.

In November 2007 an Email and Calendar Review Team (ECRT) was formed with the mission to "Evaluate the options for enhancing student and alumni mail/calendaring services and the advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing student and alumni email/calendaring services." The team was made up of 11 CaTS representatives. They considered several possibilities: staying with the current systems, moving all users to on premise Microsoft Exchange environment or outsourcing the service.

As part of the study there was a comprehensive WSU communication needs survey of faculty, staff and students to identify requirements and desired features of an email and calendaring solution. The survey determined that the WSU community wanted:

1. More storage space (This requirement has only increased. Requests for multiple gigabyte quotas are frequent.)
2. Synchronization of email and calendar with clients and smartphones.
3. Web access from all computer platforms.
4. Full support for the Outlook client for email and calendaring
5. Instant Messaging, shared folders, file sharing

The committee also contacted a number of other schools with regards to their email and calendaring solutions. They found that many schools, Kent State, University of Cincinnati, The Ohio State University, and Ohio University were either considering or in the process of implementing an outsourced solution for their students. All of these schools with the exception of Kent State were outsourcing their student email to Microsoft.

The committee reviewed both the Microsoft Live@edu offering and Google Apps.

Google was rejected because at that time they were not willing to commit to maintaining data on servers within the United States and would not commit to not data mining email or documents in the application space.

Microsoft was selected because Live@edu provided:

1. An Exchange server environment for integrated email and calendaring
2. 10G Email diskspace
3. 25G file space (now 7G)
4. Synchronization of email and calendaring
5. Support for multiple OS platforms and browsers
6. Support for a blind and low vision view
7. Instant messaging
8. Willingness to negotiate contract amendments

Additional considerations were:

1. Cost of implementation which were considered to be lower than Google because of existing Microsoft infrastructure. We will actually see a cost savings of approximately $115,246/year broken out as follows:

   .5 FTE - 58,500
   Hardware - 25,566
   Software - 31,240
   Total Yearly Savings - $115,276

2. Integration with the direction of WSU's Active Directory and Microsoft Office Applications
3. The State of Ohio's implementation of email services to Microsoft Exchange
4. Many of universities in the state moved students to Live@edu and are considering moving faculty and staff as well. Universities choosing Live@edu are OSU, OU, U of Toledo, Bowling Green, UC, Cleveland State, and Shawnee State. In addition, while Kent State moved their students to Google they are actively pursuing the move of their Faculty and Staff to Microsoft.

2) In light of any subsequent developments and observations, was Microsoft the correct choice? Is there any reason to not reopen the discussion and consider Google or other service vendors. This question is asked in the context of two realities. First, a large number of peer and other institutions have selected Google. Second, a large number of our users aggregate their content on Google anyway. Therefore, it is reasonable to ask if we better serve the university community by validating the choices that many, if not most, of them already seem to have made for themselves. Note that these questions are not of necessity an indictment of the current choice. They are meant to assess the degree to which choices made to date impact our ability to make possibly better choices in the future.

We continue to be convinced that choosing Microsoft for email and calendaring was the correct choice in light of subsequent developments. Additional state

entities and state universities and colleges are choosing Microsoft allowing a synergy and shared knowledge base for future corroborative efforts. We were also able to receive considerable assistance and insight during our implementation from The Ohio State University and Ohio University allowing us to implement Live@edu for students with no outside vendor consulting.

Being part of the common environment of Microsoft email and calendar is proving beneficial as we begin discussions and planning for the move to the latest Microsoft offering, Office365. There is also discussion at the state level of working with Microsoft on a statewide contract for terms and conditions, pricing, and features.

We have also been able to integrate the email and calendaring provisioning and life-cycle maintenance processes with the existing university account management processes. The effort, time and lessons learned from the move of students to Live@edu will be beneficial can be used for future Microsoft migrations.

Our underlying premise has been that an integrated environment for Faculty, Staff, and Students is highly desirable and provides many benefits from the standpoint of shared address books and calendaring as well as file sharing. It also provides a consistent environment for those who change roles and those with dual roles. We are hopeful that we can address any outstanding issues and concerns so that we can move forward with what we believe is a positive to change for the university.

We now have over thirty-seven thousand student accounts at Live@edu with fourteen thousand alumni scheduled to be migrated in April. While there have been some minor issues we have had surprisingly few HEAT tickets generated and all of those have been addressed in a timely manner. Many times it is just a matter of doing a task in a slightly different way in the new environment. As with any change, there is an adjustment to the new way of doing something but overall, the students have had positive comments about Raider Mail, especially the storage space.

3) Why does Wright State University and/or Microsoft require administrator access to privately owned devices? This setup is commonly used for devices that are owned by a company and issued to employees for work use only. To the best of my knowledge, universities do not customarily exercise this degree of control over private property that students, staff, and faculty use to access data and services. Is there is a legitimate reason for WSU to have this degree of control over end user devices? If so, what is it? If there is no legitimate reason, is there a mechanism for turning this off?

In order to enable the active sync service for email and calendar with Iphone and Android clients, an Exchange server requires that you enable security to continue synchronizing. Since Live@edu is a Microsoft Exchange environment the administrative access is required. This would be the same for Google if you were using the Exchange configuration although there are other options; Google sync or IMAP, available for Google.

We are working with Microsoft to see if there is a way to removing/limiting administrative access after the initial setup and configuration.

4) What are the specific plans to deal with spam and junk email?

The proposed configuration for Live@edu and Office365 includes mail from the Internet and mail within the Microsoft environment to be analyzed by our existing Proofpoint servers. Proofpoint partners with Microsoft to support this configuration.

5) Presuming use of Raider Mail, is there any mechanism for improving the "lite" interface so that it provides a complete slate of services to those not using Microsoft products?

If using a supported browser version as stated in response to Concern #3, the only combination not supporting all features for the proposed Office365 or Live@edu services is Linux OS with the Chrome browser.

6) What are the specific actions being taken to detect and ameliorate lost email? There are already documented cases of students never receiving email sent to them by faculty and that these lost emails are related to Raider Mail. If these problems were to become more widespread and affect emails among faculty and staff, operations could be severely degraded. Is there a comprehensive testing program underway that will quantify the extent of the problem, identify causes, and fix outstanding issues before moving forward? What is this plan?

If the Help Desk is notified of "lost messages," CaTS will investigate and determine the cause of the problem. CaTS is aware that there were bounced messages during a limited time period but have not found any actual cases of "lost messages." Clients with concerns about lost messages or any other email problems should contact the CaTS Help Desk so that we can investigate the problem.

7) Can we have a specific and focused demo to the faculty senate IT committee of Gmail accounts, Android devices, and Ios devices pulling email from Raider Mail via IMAP

and POP. We appreciated the demo of the web interface. It would be instructive to all involved to see live demos of the configuration necessary to enable these other means of legitimate access to mail. It will also be useful to see that proper and consistent service is provided via these transport mechanisms.

Microsoft supports both IMAP and POP protocols and the configurations are documented in the Frequently Asked Questions. Since there is no standard for the Android setup varies by carrier making it slightly more complex to configure. This is true regardless of the email provider. CaTS can arrange for a demonstration IMAP and POP with Raider Mail.

Google provides information and demonstration videos at: http://learn.googleapps.com/gmail

8) Is there any way to make a forward and delete setting to raider email? If not, is there any mechanism for adding it?

Yes. In the section under See All Options is an option to forward messages. There is a checkbox for **Keep a copy of forwarded messages in Outlook Web App**, which, if unchecked, would not keep a copy of the message on the server.

9) There appears to be issues with distributed authentication methods used on campus as indicated in concern #6 in the previous numbered list. Federated identity management in Microsoft products (as verified by a call to Microsoft) can be subtle and potentially challenging to configure properly. Assuming that federated identity management or some other similar mechanism for maintaining local control over a centralized authentication system is in use, do we have on staff anyone who has the appropriate industry certifications and experience one would expect of someone spearheading this technically challenging process? If not, has the university contracted with an organization that does? What is the plan for tracking down and fixing what (perhaps naively) appear to be authentication issues across services?

Wright State does not currently use Federated Identity Management for the Live@edu environment but we have implemented single sign on from WINGS to Raider Mail. There is a separate password required for Raider Mail in order to use smartphones or full email clients. During the move to Raider Mail documentation was provided to each client on how to configure these devices/clients.

If a client has a problem accessing Raider Mail they are encouraged to call the CaTS Help Desk who can assist them in setting up their email, resetting their password, and answering any questions they might have.

10) Is off-campus hosting of email compatible with our FERPA requirements? Is CaTS providing a technological solution that is consistent with these requirements? There was indication in the last IT committee meeting that some of these concerns would be settled "by policy". What exactly does "by policy" mean? There are concerns that CaTS will be tempted to shed responsibility for developing comprehensive technological compliance solutions by displacing that responsibility to end users via "policies". It is assumed that CaTS has no such intention. However, some clarity about what is meant by "policy" would certainly calm any lingering fears.

A number of schools have placed pressure on Google and Microsoft to amend its contract language, particularly to address FERPA concerns in outsourced student, faculty and staff mail, and they have become more willing to negotiate those terms and assume responsibility to maintain the privacy of those records in the same manner as is required of institutions. Under FERPA, a school can outsource the processing of education records, which may include email, but that outsourcing can only happen if the service provider is subject to the same terms the school is subject to. It is critical to insist that the language regarding FERPA protections be included in contracts for the out-sourcing of all email.

It is the responsibility of the university community to secure protected FERPA, HIPPA, and PCI data through encryption of messages and storage and deletion methods. CaTS is implementing an email encryption service that will include selective encryption of messages by the client and encryption of protected data through detection. Polices require that the university community follow guidelines and procedures for the securing of the protected data.

We anticipate that most if not all calls for support will naturally go through the CaTS Helpdesk and our reviewing ways to reinforce that within the service. In addition, our Microsoft rep has indicated that "In some circumstances if you open a support case opened the support engineer may be offshore and may have access to message header info (if you allow them) but not core email data. This is usually enough to satisfy customer concerns in this area. If you wish, you could ask the case to be taken by a US based support engineer at the time the call is put in, but you may need to wait for US hours for the case to be managed. We do not have the capacity to route your helpdesk calls proactively to the US."

11) There are occasional fears that some service vendors solicit services at an introductory rate and after migration, raise prices. Does WSU have any contract with Microsoft that locks in a favorable and/or predictable cost for a lengthy period of years? Is there any plan for migrating email and calendar services away from Microsoft if any portion of the deal sours in the future?

CaTS has/will contract with Microsoft when the decision is made for specified services at the quoted price. The contract specifies a notification of cancelation by either party of the contract. CaTS does have a plan in place to set up our own Microsoft Exchange server onsite if there is a need to move services away from the hosted Microsoft service including the migration of data and ongoing email and calendar services.

Considering the critical importance of reliable electronic messaging to the whole of the University's mission, and further considering that failures of email systems are very public and very damaging, comprehensive evaluation of this service is critical. It is hoped that it is understood that these questions are being raised in the interest of preventing institutional embarrassment. If in the final analysis there was no reason to have been concerned, we will still be well served by building confidence in both the vendor chosen and the processes by which that choice was made.

We appreciate the opportunity to address the concerns and look forward to working more closely with faculty on this and future projects.

John C. Gallagher
Associate Professor of Computer Science and Engineering
Faculty Senate IT Committee Chair, 2011 - 2012